

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 11-15, 20-24, 26 and 30 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 11, 13, 20, 22-24 and 26 are amended, and claims 9-10, 16-19, 25 and 27-29 are canceled. Support for the amendment to claims 1, 5, 7, 11, 13, 20, 22-24 and 26 can be found, for example, in the original claim 17 and in the specification, paragraph [0038]. No new matter is added.

Claim 2 was objected to on the ground of informalities and has been amended responsive to the Examiner's remarks.

Applicants respectfully request the objection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-8, 11, 12, 22-24 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Ohtaka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,151,000); and claims 17 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ohtaka in view of Shigeta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,297,788). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Ohtaka in view of Shigeta does not teach a plurality of sub-frames, which are set for a series of electro-optical elements among a plurality of electro-optical elements, the series of electro-optical elements being connected to at least two scanning lines, end substantially simultaneously, as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claims 5, 7, 11, 13, 22-24 and 26 which have all been amended to included the limitations of dependent claim 17.

The Office Action incorrectly asserts that Fig. 7d of Ohtaka discloses a series of pixels among the plurality of pixels, ending substantially simultaneously. However, Ohtaka does not teach a series of electro-optical elements being connected to at least two scanning lines, end substantially simultaneously. The claim language refers to the ending of the series of electro-optical elements, and *not the duration of the sustaining period*. Furthermore, the office action asserts that Shigeta discloses a series of pixels connected to at least two scanning

lines (Figs. 7a-7h), however, Shigeta does not teach nor make it possible to infer that the series of electro-optical elements end substantially simultaneously. Therefore, neither Ohtaka nor Shigeta teach a series of electro-optical elements being connected to at least two scanning lines, end substantially simultaneously, as originally recited in dependent claim 17 and currently recited in the independent claims.

Due to the inappropriateness of the rejection to dependent claim 17, and in light of the amendments to the independent claims, Applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 13-15 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ohtaka in view of Wakitani et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,940,142). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Wakitani does not teach or suggest the deficiencies of Ohtaka as discussed above with respect to independent claims 13 and 26 (i.e., the features of original claim 17), as well as the further limitations contained therein. Therefore, Ohtaka in view of Wakitani does not support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 16, 18-21, 27 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ohtaka in view of Adachi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,924,824). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Adachi does not teach the deficiencies of Ohtaka as discussed above with respect to independent claims 1 and 22, as well as the further limitations contained therein. Therefore, Ohtaka in view of Adachi does not support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

John A. Radi
Registration No. 59,345

JAO:JAR/axl

Attachment:
Request for Continued Examination

Date: February 1, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
